

DAILY REPORT

MONDAY
29 JULY 1963

SUPPLEMENT

World Reaction Series

NO. 6 -- 1963

FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION
TO THE MOSCOW NUCLEAR TEST BAN AGREEMENT

WARNING

Laws relating to copyright, libel, and communications require that dissemination of this publication be limited to persons having an official interest in its contents. Exception can be granted only by the issuing agency, and users are warned that noncompliance may subject violators to personal liability.

STATOTHR

The DAILY REPORT presents material from current foreign broadcasts, press transmissions, and selected newspapers. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should therefore not be inferred that they have been transmitted only in the language or to the area indicated. Headlines, editor's notes, and editorial reports are composed by

STATOTHR

FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION
TO THE MOSCOW NUCLEAR TEST BAN AGREEMENT

29 JULY 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	i
I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES	1
A. France and Great Britain	1
B. Other West European Countries	4
C. Asia and the Far East	8
D. The Middle East and Africa	11
E. Latin America and Canada	15
II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES	17
A. The USSR	17
B. Communist China	20
C. European Communist Countries	22
1. The Pro-Soviet Bloc	22
2. Yugoslavia	25
3. Albania	25
D. Cuba	26

Press comment derives mainly from radio sources. In the interest of brevity, newspapers are sometimes cited directly.

This report is based on information available to FBIS up to 0500 GMT 29 July.



STATOTHR

SUMMARY

Radio and press commentators of noncommunist countries generally praise the Moscow agreement to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water as a major, historical step toward reducing international tension and one that may lead to a general detente between East and West. Commentators and government spokesmen often disagree, however, on the practical effect the agreement may have without the participation of France and Communist China.

The Paris radio and French newspapers defer to President de Gaulle's anticipated press conference remarks on the agreement 29 July, but they predict in early comments that France will proceed with nuclear tests to develop its own deterrent despite the Moscow agreement. Opposition French papers criticize what they call De Gaulle's "insane policy," while Gaullist editorial writers defend France's desire for peace and deny any isolationist viewpoint. British press editorials welcome the Moscow agreement as a first step toward a detente, but are cautious about overestimating the agreement's practical effects as well as what it may lead to in subsequent East-West negotiations.

West German spokesmen welcome the agreement and "unreservedly" support President Kennedy's views on its strengths and weaknesses, while press comments which generally praise the agreement show considerable concern over the proposed nonaggression pact. Bonn leaders will be "very cautious" in discussing this proposal, reports say. Other West European commentators hail the agreement as a long-awaited step toward reducing tension with many expressing concern over France's attitude toward the agreement.

Asian and Far Eastern noncommunist governments and commentators praise the agreement as a significant step forward, with Japanese media pointing out Japan's special gratitude, based on its own unique experience with nuclear bombing. Japanese spokesman show caution about joining in the agreement, while the Indian Government says it is ready to sign the treaty as soon as it is available. Australian spokesmen also announce willingness to sign. Nationalist Chinese and South Vietnamese commentators and editorials show skepticism of any agreement with the communists.

Middle East and African leaders and commentators generally applaud the agreement as a step forward and express the hope that it will lead to further steps toward a complete test ban agreement and general disarmament. There are also some expressions of misgiving about the limited nature of the agreement. UAR President Nasir welcomes the agreement as a "first step toward ending the cold war and toward disarmament." While Israeli commentators generally welcome the agreement as a turning point in the cold war, one notes that it is not an interbloc agreement but "merely an agreement between the big atomic powers." African commentators similarly welcome the agreement but with reservations concerning French and Chinese aloofness from it.

Latin American reaction to the agreement and President Kennedy's 26 July speech on it is very favorable. Mexican Foreign Minister Tello is quoted as saying Mexico will sign the treaty as soon as possible. Many commentators stress the improvement in East-West relations which the agreement implies. A Chilean paper says the treaty shows that the communists and the West can reach agreement through negotiations, while a Bogota paper wonders if Colombia should now reexamine its policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev's widely broadcast "interview" with IZVESTIYA and PRAVDA--the same device he had used to comment on the President's American University speech--highlights Soviet propaganda welcoming what IZVESTIYA says will be known as "the Moscow treaty." Editorials in PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA echo Khrushchev's expression of hope that this "first step" will ease tensions. In this context both repeat the call for a nonaggression treaty and the other measures advanced in his 19 July speech--still without indicating the relationship among these measures, their relative priority, or the forum in which they might be discussed. Commentators continue to note the importance of banning underground tests, although Khrushchev says nothing about underground testing in the interview. Moscow's overwhelming stress is on favorable worldwide reaction to the treaty, although opposition in some Western circles is noted, France's position is deplored, and two fairly authoritative press articles castigate the Chinese communists for their sanguine attitude toward war. While Soviet domestic radio listeners hear IZVESTIYA's diplomatic observer Polyakov complain that the President said socialist states "should repudiate their aggressive plans," Moscow's overall treatment of his radio/TV report is highly favorable. In recounting the speech TASS leaves out passages bearing directly on the cold war.

Peking has sustained and sharpened its voluminous, shrill propaganda protests against the treaty, dating from its first acknowledgement on 11 July that Khrushchev had announced Soviet willingness to agree to a partial test ban. Peking's denunciations of Khrushchev's "capitulation" have become more venomous and more explicit since the initialing of the treaty. NCNA on 28 July transmits lengthy excerpts of the President's radio/TV report, interlarded with editorial comment calculated to show that the gain is all on the Western side and that the treaty is aimed at preventing socialist countries which do not have nuclear weapons from getting them. To help its readers "grasp the substance of the treaty," NCNA accompanies the text of the document with comments by Soviet delegate Kuznetsov in the Geneva disarmament talks last August objecting to a similar treaty proposed by the West. NCNA thus documents the Peking line that the present treaty is one the West has wanted all along and that it has been concluded because Khrushchev now wants the same thing.

iii

Two East European communist countries, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, have thus far expressed their intention to adhere to the agreement. The pro-Soviet satellites give Moscow the lion's share of the credit for its "stubborn efforts" and "initiatives" throughout the years, describing the treaty as a victory for peaceful coexistence. Yugoslavia predictably welcomes the agreement, and Albania predictably attacks it, Chinese style.

Havana commentators welcome the accord cautiously, calling it a victory for world peace and a contribution to detente, but with the caveat that it does not mean the world's big problems have been solved. Castro claims it was only the "awareness of a superior military force" which made the "imperialists" face reality and agree to the test ban.

I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

A. France and Great Britain

France: While prominently reporting the Moscow test ban agreement and the resultant world reaction, the Paris radio offers little comment, explaining that official reaction will be forthcoming only after President de Gaulle's 29 July press conference. In this immediate context, the radio recalls French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville's 25 July observation that "the termination of nuclear tests is not a disarmament measure but only one which crystallizes the difference of positions between those who have and those who do not have the atomic bomb. The French Government will continue to implement its atomic program." Couve de Murville adds that the test ban talks will "not prevent France from continuing the development of its nuclear deterrent" and that "in the absence of an agreement on effective, controlled disarmament, France could not sacrifice its atomic armament."

In a commentary on the agreement, Paris radio commentator Maurice Ferro emphasizes that though all signatories to the treaty refer to it as a "first step," the end of tests by the two "great powers" does not change a thing: "They want only to prevent other countries from developing a nuclear potential which could paralyze them." Insofar as the present agreement constitutes the starting point of a real East-West confrontation, the most significant consideration is the Soviet-proposed NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression treaty, Ferro then explains. In this respect, he adds, the Americans, aware of their "very delicate position" in relation to their NATO allies and recognizing that France, too, has a right to share in the bargaining with the Russians, have carefully separated the test ban from the nonaggression pact, thus proving that despite allegations of "certain circles," France is not isolated.

According to REUTERS, General de Gaulle's reaction to the signing of the agreement is "very reserved," and the agency quoted "sources close to De Gaulle" as saying that French experiments and tests involving missiles and the hydrogen bomb will "last until 1970."

The Gaullist paper LA NATION writes on 25 July that there is a fundamental contradiction in hoping to see a European force and at the same time condemning its eventual components. LE FIGARO called the agreement of "more symptomatic than real value."

Later LA NATION says: "If there is going to be an entente, France will be the first to feel satisfaction. France is also peace-loving; it is even more so than the two supergiants whose countless experiments have for years shaken the world."

"However, there is no more agreement over real nuclear disarmament after the Moscow Treaty than there was during the six years of negotiations. Thus, the French position, which would be modified only in the event of real disarmament, will remain unchanged. Having decided, like Britain, to have a nuclear force capable of becoming a European force when there is a European government, France cannot but continue with its research. France does not feel like letting the supreme weapon remain in the hands of the giants alone, thus relegating France, Europe, and the rest of the world to a definite, backward, and intolerable impotence."

The Paris COMBAT writes that "the vital step" has been taken and, for the first time, the three major nuclear powers have reached an agreement, thereby lifting the political obstacle which stood in the way of a detente. LIBERATION says that the desire to limit the spread of nuclear weapons is "realistic" and "if we wish to continue on this road, as we should, who can fail to see how atomic disarmament would become more and more difficult and the risks of an atomic war greater, as more major powers in the world come to possess such weapons of mass destruction?" The Socialist LE POPULAIRE says it is "inconceivable" that De Gaulle, "for the sake of continuing an insane policy, is deliberately provoking the isolation of France, with resulting dire consequences. Gaullist diplomacy has already noticeably weakened the influence of our country in most Western countries."

PARIS-JOUR says that "already one can foresee General de Gaulle's reaction, which is that of most Frenchmen: the agreement is good news, as it demonstrates Khrushchev's desire to seek a rapprochement with the West, and it further confirms Khrushchev's hostility for the Chinese." However, says PARIS-JOUR, "it is expected that General de Gaulle will put our Anglo-Saxon allies to the test by insisting on their giving him--that is Europe--a seat at the table of the future East-West conference. Peace, which is fervently desired by the French, concerns the French just as much as it concerns the other great powers, and the Yalta Conference has left too many bad memories for the French to permit a repetition."

Great Britain: The British press generally welcomes the test ban, the BBC says, but there is an air of caution in some cases.

The TIMES writes that the main criticism of the treaty will be that "it is not the foundation stone for disarmament that once seemed a possible result of the three-power talks in Geneva," but must be recognized as being "only the minimal first step toward a check in the arms race." It is, according to the DAILY TELEGRAPH, "only a humble beginning" but "it nevertheless represents a step forward which will be welcomed by millions of people around the world."

The DAILY HERALD says that 25 July will be remembered as "the day when the world took a step toward sanity." The GUARDIAN sees the treaty as symptomatic of "the more confident relations that have grown up between the United States and Russia in the past year or two, interrupted by Cuba."

The DAILY EXPRESS says that while the treaty falls short of the ideal, "it is the first agreement on broad principle between East and West since the war," and "the credit for it goes to one man beyond any other, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan. Almost alone among world statesmen, Mr. Macmillan has always believed that this agreement was possible." The DAILY MAIL says this is not the millenium introducing peace on earth, "but it is a step along the road to better relations between East and West."

The 29 July TIMES observes that Chinese spokesman Kuo Mo-jo's statement that the present monopoly of nuclear weapons would be smashed "in the not too distant future" should be read in context "if exaggerated fears of China's nuclear potential are not to gain ground." The desire for equality with the West "demands that Chinese skills must be demonstrably the equal of the Western ones. Hence Kuo's insistence that China should develop nuclear know-how and the industrial capacity necessary to back it."

The GUARDIAN believes that the strength of the Moscow test ban is that it expresses the common interest of both sides to avoid further pollution of the atmosphere. The GUARDIAN adds: "One question, probably now the most vital, was mentioned by Mr. Kennedy in his broadcast: the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to states which do not now have them." The GUARDIAN says that control was not practicable in 1959 when the USSR and China still were close allies, but "it will be more so today. Moreover, the USSR has an added interest now in that none of the likely recipients would be an ally of the Soviet Union." The GUARDIAN adds that now, with both sides in a frame of mind to discuss further ways of reducing tension, "no subject should be excluded. The treaty should be followed by a cautious reexamination of policies which have been treated as immutable for the duration of the cold war."

Speaking in Wales, George Brown, deputy leader of the British Labor Party, says that the agreement should lead either to East-West mutual inspection or disengagement in central Europe. "It could well be that some agreement providing for withdrawal or even just for mutual inspection of each other's activities in this area is possible," he says.

Fire: AFP reports that Eire has announced it will sign the test ban treaty as soon as it is ratified by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain.

B. Other West European Countries

West Germany: The West German Federal Government supports the aim of the Moscow treaty as an initial step in the direction of complete disarmament under the strictest international control, DPA says, citing a government spokesman. Also, the agency reports, Bonn government circles "unreservedly" agree with President Kennedy's views on the test ban agreement with regard to its "future possibilities as well as its weaknesses."

Both West German Government and press opinion temper their "considerable acclaim" for the test ban with "cautious optimism" with regard to this treaty's marking the beginning of a turning point in the cold war. The Moscow communique's words about discussions concerning a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression treaty are a source of almost universal West German anxiety, as is the suggestion that all states, even the GDR, might accede to the test ban treaty, thus fulfilling the Soviet aim of indirect recognition of the East German satellite. Efficacy of the test ban is conditioned in comment by both press and party spokesmen on the position of France and Communist China, both of whom are represented as striving for recognition as nuclear powers despite contrary world currents.

Bonn Government circles draw satisfaction from the test ban provisions in view of West Germany's own renunciation of such weapons, a DPA correspondent points out. An SPD press service spokesman feels that the Moscow agreement will have a positive influence on the forthcoming Geneva disarmament talks. He voices the hope that underground tests will also be banned soon. The CDU-CSU press service finds it "regrettable" that the French Government has not found it possible to participate in the negotiations.

The proposed nonaggression pact comes in for most West German attention, the government spokesman contending that it would make sense for the Federal Government only if coupled with steps toward the solution of those problems responsible for tension in Europe. The CDU-CSU press service adds in this connection that possible agreements must not lead to one-sided entrenchment of the military strength relationships or the cementing of the division of Germany. DPA points out that official circles will operate "very cautiously" in discussions within the Western alliance as a whole and with France separately, as well as in early cabinet and parliamentary consultations. In this context, too, West German sources welcome British Ambassador Frank's assurance that there is no link between the nuclear test ban and the nonaggression pact.

Klaus Mehnert over West German television welcomes the agreement, but points out that the three big powers involved are not giving up much since all are well stocked with nuclear bombs and can still continue their underground tests. There seems to be little hope that this agreement will prevent France and the CPR from developing their own nuclear weapons, Mehnert states.

He also stresses that Khrushchev may want to bolster Ulbricht internationally if he succeeds in making the West sign a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, an agreement which would also bear Ulbricht's signature. On the other hand, Khrushchev may want to indicate a basic change in Soviet policy toward the Western world, as happened in 1939 with the signing of the German-USSR pact.

Virtually all West German newspapers carry banner headlines on the successful conclusion of the Moscow talks, with editorials differing in their assessment but generally showing caution and warning against a possible "catch" in the Soviet policy, as DIE WELT, Hamburg independent, puts it. Optimism is voiced inasmuch as an ending of tests will halt pollution of the atmosphere and possibly lead to an international detente. Some papers speculate concerning the possibility of new developments regarding the German problem.

The MUENCHNER MERKUR so far is the only West German paper commenting on President Kennedy's 26 July speech and his possible difficulties in gaining the two-thirds support of the Senate necessary for ratification of the Moscow agreement. The report points out that it is expected in Washington that Kennedy will be successful if he uses his prestige fully.

Italy: The Italian press, referring frequently to the test ban agreement as the most significant development in East-West relations since World War II, suggests it is a significant turning point in history, opening the way to a detente on a world scale. At the same time there are pointed references to French and Chinese intransigence, described in some instances as the source of both U.S. and Soviet fear. Even the communist UNITA speculates that the "act of wisdom" in Moscow could "modify the very notion of two blocs opposing one another." In line with the recurrent view that the way has been opened to wide discussions of unsettled problems, IL MESSAGGERO hints at a tripartite summit meeting which might go so far as to discuss the German problem. LA VOCE REPUBBLICANA says it is appropriate to again warn "those nations and groups which cherish the hope of reaching nuclear equality, which will be the beginning of proliferation," and IL POPOLO describes both Paris and Peking indications that they will persist in their nuclear policy. IL TEMPO is particularly alarmed by the appearance of "an aggressive force, not subject to any control, which is undermining the foundations of the building of peace" and which has made it clear that "global peace cannot be negotiated with Khrushchev alone; one must meet Mao as well."

Amid what the Rome radio calls "much comment" by Italian political circles on the Moscow agreement only Social Democrat Saragat's remarks calling the treaty "a powerful step toward peace" are quoted.

L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, the organ of the Vatican, under the heading "good omen," emphasizes that the agreement reached by the three powers is "what the Church had always hoped for all the nations of the world."

Austria: The Austrian radio prominently features reports on initialing of the test ban treaty and routinely reports President Kennedy's 26 July radio and television address. There has been no monitored radio comment thus far. The Austrian press gives top coverage to the test ban agreement, and three-quarters of the available noncommunist papers carry editorial comment ranging in tenor from enthusiastic to cautious welcoming of the test ban. Most papers consider the expected rejection of the agreement by Paris and Peking its main flaw, but some also voice misgivings over the possibility that it might serve Khrushchev as a lever to extort concessions from the West.

The semiofficial newspaper WIENER ZEITUNG observes: "The initialing of the test ban agreement is a historic event, the crowning of five years of endeavor. It should mark the beginning of an era which ultimately will lead to the replacement of the balance of terror by a balance of trust." The independent SALZBERGER NACHRICHTEN asks: "What caused this most conspicuous haste of the Soviets?" It adds that it could be possible for the test ban treaty to become a turning point in the cold war, but it possibly could also be no genuine cause for rosy optimism, "for too often Moscow has deceived the gullible free nations. One will have to wait and see." The independent KURIER says: "There has been a spirit of Geneva, a spirit of Camp David, a spirit of Vienna, and every time it was the East which has broken this trust and violated this spirit. Nevertheless the West's motto is that to strengthen the position of Khrushchev is to strengthen the most liberal communist leader, who knows what will come after him."

Benelux Countries: The Belgian Foreign Ministry is "highly satisfied" with the nuclear test ban agreement reached in Moscow, according to the Brussels radio. The radio adds that a ministry spokesman stated that while the treaty does not mean real disarmament, "it can nevertheless be regarded as the first expression of a new spirit."

Switzerland: The Swiss press generally welcomes the test ban agreement. Initial comment by DIE TAT suggests that the agreement might signal the end of the cold war, with the United States and the USSR jointly setting up a global system of peace and security based on their nuclear hegemony.

NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG sees a "more flexible attitude toward Berlin" on the part of East Germany as a reflection of Moscow's increasing concern at the controversy with Peking which makes it necessary to treat Ulbricht and his policies as more or less expendable. The same paper warns against reading too much into the test ban agreement, for, it says, rearming can continue unhampered and both the United States and the USSR already have sufficient nuclear potential to annihilate any opponent.

Scandinavia: The majority of Scandinavian papers, welcoming the U.S.-British-Soviet agreement as "an historic turningpoint" in East-West relations, point out that the treaty's significance is primarily psychological and warn that outside countries constitute a factor which could nullify it. Area newscasts report that the Nordic countries have already received from the United States an appeal to join the treaty and that this will be considered promptly.

Swedish Foreign Minister Nilsson says in a statement broadcast by the Stockholm radio that "the Swedish Government and the Swedish people note with joy that the three great powers have reached an agreement." Nilsson adds that "the agreement now reached must be considered extremely important" since it is a "step on the road to a complete test ban." The SVENSKA DAGBLADET warns that the agreement "in no way means disarmament" but adds that it "may mean the beginning of a new epoch in the relationship between the USSR and the Western powers--a prospect all the more fascinating when seen against the background of the profound crisis between Moscow and Peking." The paper cautions that it is too early to talk of a genuine detente, however, for less than a week ago Khrushchev "recalled in this respect that the German problem was the big and decisive issue--and here the situation is just as deadlocked as before."

Finnish Premier Karjalainen says that the three-power agreement has created better conditions for implementation of Finnish policies already expounded in its peace treaty contract not to make or retain nuclear weapons, its consistent opposition to all nuclear tests, and the proposal that the spread of nuclear weapons be blocked at least by establishing the Nordic areas as a nuclear-free zone. A Helsinki radio commentary speaks of the Moscow agreement as having engendered "guarded optimism" which, though not eliminating differences, reflects an improved international atmosphere in which peaceful settlement of disputes might be possible. While specifically noting opposition to the agreement in the U.S. Congress, the commentator anticipates the necessary two-thirds support for Mr. Kennedy. The Finnish press, notably the PAIVAN SANOMAT and TURKU PAIVALEHTI, are particularly preoccupied with the "alarming feature" of "countries remaining outside the agreement."

Portugal: The Lisbon radio says that it would be "excessively naive" to assume that Western diplomacy does not have a great task before it just because the Russians seem willing to reach an agreement. Russia does not want or need a war, because she is attaining her objectives, says the radio. The Portuguese newspaper A VOZ describes the agreement and points out that "no thought was given to the idea of one of the signatories asking a nonsignatory country to allow them to carry out some fireworks on their territory. It is hoped that a more complete treaty will be forthcoming which will go as far as prohibiting underground tests." However, "in this treaty there is at least a little honorable sincerity and it is, therefore, a great step."

Spain: While there has been no official comment in Madrid, according to AFP, the Spanish press devotes much attention to the test ban agreement. YA calls it a "step on the right path, a step which may be the beginning of a new era in international relations." ABC feels that the great objective of the "two K's" is "to prevent the proliferation of nuclear arms by blocking France's progress toward atomic independence in the West and the detonation of the first Chinese bomb in the East."

C. Asia and the Far East

India: Hailing the treaty as a "landmark in international cooperation," an Indian Government press note reported by the Delhi radio announces India's readiness to sign a nuclear test ban treaty as soon as it is available for signature. The statement expresses the hope that all countries concerned with peace and human progress would also sign it and that the Moscow agreement would speedily lead to a treaty on general and complete disarmament. The radio also quotes Prime Minister Nehru as saying that the agreement is good news "for the whole world."

Japan: Initialing of the treaty is given prompt and tremendous play by the Japanese press, radio, and television, all hailing the treaty as "epoch-making," "a joyful event," "a result of praiseworthy compromise," and citing President Kennedy's warning against "overoptimism." Japanese information media make the point that Japan, "as the only nation ever to be atom-bombed," is especially happy over the signing, while commentators often express regret that the treaty will not be binding upon France and Communist China.

Although the leading papers note that the treaty does not cover underground testing and express guarded optimism, echoing Foreign Minister Ohira's statement that "no optimism is warranted," ASAHI editorially praises the Soviet Union for failure to insist on its demand for the conclusion of a nonaggression pact and for making the "bigger concessions," but deplores the clause which provides for the withdrawal of a signatory nation upon three months' notice. It observes: "Actually, the treaty is astonishingly flexible."

TOKYO SHIMBUN editorially hints that the treaty may encourage disturbances and disputes in Southeast Asian countries neighboring Communist China, whose formula for revolution is to resort to force when necessary.

Although President Kennedy's report to the nation is given prominence by the Japanese press, little attention is given to the president's "sudden" proposal to Prime Minister Ikeda inviting Japan to participate in the test ban treaty. In a radio-television network panel discussion, Foreign Minister Ohira says: "I am not particularly opposed to Japan's participation in the treaty. I only think there is no need to hurry as the treaty has not been ratified." He adds that there is no need to change Japan's basic foreign and defense policy.

The communist AKAHATA, in an editorial giving the first official reaction of the Japan Communist Party, charges that the danger of nuclear war still exists because the treaty provided for a signatory's right to withdraw from the agreement and "because the United States has concentrated on underground nuclear testing." It expresses no position toward the Soviet Union but defends Communist China, saying that the CPR has "consistently" called for a total ban on nuclear weapons test, while the United States is opposed "even to an agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons."

Ceylon: Premier Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, in a statement broadcast by the Colombo radio, hails the agreement as "an important first step on the road to world peace," and expresses the hope that the present achievement will usher in a new era of international confidence and pave the way toward general and complete disarmament.

Malaya: Malaya has joined other nations in welcoming the treaty, says the Kuala Lumpur radio, reporting that Prime Minister Rahman, in congratulatory messages to U.S., British, and Soviet leaders, described the agreement as an "historic landmark toward the lessening of world tension," and quoting him as saying that Malaya is looking forward to an era of peaceful coexistence and closer cooperation among the major powers.

Nationalist China: The Taipei radio quotes a number of editorials warning the Western nations not to relax vigilance against the USSR. The HSIEN SHENG PAO cautions about placing too much confidence in the agreement because the USSR, like any member of the communist bloc, cannot be trusted. After signing the treaty the Soviet Union may use its resources to develop other instruments of war, such as rocket and chemical weapons, the paper says. The YOUNG WARRIOR DAILY warns against Soviet plots to alienate U.S.-French relations, while the CHUNG HUA DAILY predicts a heated debate in the U.S. Senate and the British Parliament on ratification of the treaty.

Regarding the nonaggression pact being pressed by the Soviet Union, the CHUNG HUA DAILY anticipates strong opposition by France and West Germany and fears that Kennedy's "peace strategy" will bring about discord among the Western allies.

Philippines: The signing of the agreement is reported prominently by Filipino media. President Macapagal is reported to have called the treaty "a major breakthrough in the stalemated negotiations on disarmament."

Australia: Melbourne radio reports extensively on the signing of the treaty and subsequent statements by Macmillan and Khrushchev expressing the hope that the treaty will lead to further East-West agreements.

Australian External Affairs Minister Sir Garfield Barwick is reported to have stated that the necessary steps for Australia to become a member of the treaty "will be taken immediately." The Australian minister describes the treaty as a "significant breakthrough" in East-West relations and "among the most important agreements yet made between the West and the Soviet Union." Australian Labor Party leader Calwell says the agreement reflects an easing of world tension and expresses the hope that although the treaty does not ban the making or stockpiling of weapons this will be the next logical move. Commenting on the treaty, the Melbourne HERALD says the agreement came in "dramatic contrast" to fruitless conferences of the past, and it is to be hoped that France and other nations will sign the agreement.

Indonesia: The Djakarta radio takes only passing notice of the test ban treaty, its only reference coming in an item reporting the departure of Subandrio and Sukarno for Manila. It quotes Subandrio as saying that Indonesia will support any understanding among the big powers for relaxing threats of war. According to AFP, Subandrio welcomed the agreement as "a move toward lessening the threat of war." He said Indonesia hopes the agreement will be taken as one of the foundation stones toward the ultimate aim of world peace.

South Vietnam: Although some editorials in the Saigon-Cholon press view the treaty signing with optimism, the majority express their habitual pessimism on East-West dealings. Vietnamese editorialists as a rule look more favorably on the recent negotiations than the editorialists of the Chinese-language press, who tend to view international affairs in the light of their effect on a Nationalist Chinese return to the mainland.

Taking an optimistic view, LE SONG voices a belief that the dark prospect of nuclear war has been driven away and that there is a possibility of lasting peace.

SAIGON MAI, on the other hand, says the treaty will have few practical results because the nuclear arsenals of the countries involved remain intact and the danger of nuclear war has not diminished. TU DO qualifies its optimism by saying that the threat of war cannot be eliminated until nuclear weapons are destroyed.

Several papers feel that Khrushchev's motives are far from what he says they are. One paper believes he will use the treaty to induce the West into a summit meeting to discuss a nonaggression pact, thereby realizing his aim of permanently dividing Germany. Another editorialist views the treaty as a temporary measure to ease internal dissension and believes that it will be discarded as an empty agreement when Khrushchev consolidates his position.

Chinese editorialists note that the danger in the Far East comes from Communist China, and the papers generally feel that optimism is groundless "because Communist China and its henchmen are plotting to annex Southeast Asia." None of the papers touches on the subjects of reduced contamination of the atmosphere or radiation fallout, nor do they discuss President Kennedy's speech specifically.

D. The Middle East and Africa

UAR: President Nasir, in a speech reported by the Cairo radio, expresses support for Prime Minister Nehru's appeal to all nations to sign the agreement and he welcomes it as a "first step toward ending the cold war and toward disarmament." He expresses the hope that "the next step in the agreement will be the destruction of all atomic weapons, disarmament, and the allocation of all the money spent on atomic weapons and armament for the prosperity and development of peoples." In another speech carried by the radio he expresses "great satisfaction" at the signing of the agreement. A commentary by the Cairo radio points out that one of the factors contributing to the reaching of agreement was the "efforts of the nonaligned and neutral states in the disarmament committee" and their threat to withdraw from the committee "unless the big powers agreed to at least a partial suspension of nuclear tests." Another commentary notes that the optimism regarding the agreement "does not extend to various other East-West problems," such as Berlin, Germany, and disarmament inspection within Soviet territory.

Iraq: The Baghdad domestic service reports a congratulatory telegram from President Arif to Kennedy, Macmillan, and Khrushchev describing the agreement as an "important step toward bolstering peace" and expressing the hope that "this will be the beginning of work to reach an agreement banning all kinds of nuclear tests and a means for a comprehensive agreement on disarmament."

Jordan: Amman radio reports a statement by Defense Minister as-Salih that the Jordanian cabinet "welcomes" the agreement and "every similar step to establish peace and security in the world." A radio commentary points out that Premier Khrushchev has also expressed readiness to sign an agreement on banning underground nuclear tests and stresses his "leniency" in not insisting that a test-ban treaty be conditional on the signing of a non-aggression treaty between the Warsaw and NATO alliances.

Sudan: The Sudanese Minister of Information is quoted by AFP as saying that the tripartite agreement in Moscow was received with "great enthusiasm in the Sudan," and the minister said that the Sudan looks on the agreement as "a step toward total disarmament."

Israel: Premier Eshkol describes the agreement as "a positive step toward the relaxation of international tension and a solution of international problems," the Israeli radio reports. In another statement reported by the radio the Premier says the agreement "may mark a turning point leading to an improvement in the Middle East situation if as a result of it the arms shipments to Israel's enemies are stopped." The Jerusalem radio quotes Eshkol as saying that the improvement in East-West relations might improve the lot of Soviet jews. Former Premier Ben-Gurion says the importance of the agreement "should not be exaggerated, although this event undoubtedly has created a better international atmosphere."

A commentary carried by the radio says that with the initialing of the agreement, many diplomats in Geneva attending the disarmament talks, "especially the representatives of the nonaligned states, realized again that their own influence on the course of important affairs in the world is negligible." The commentary indicates two defects to the agreement: it does not cover underground tests and it "is not an interbloc agreement but merely an agreement between the big atomic powers. France and China are not partners to the agreement." In conclusion, the commentary describes the agreement as "only a rather modest beginning." The radio reports that the Israeli press regards the agreement as "a turning point in the cold war between the two blocs" and sees in it a "possibility for reducing tension in the Mediterranean region."

HAARETZ is quoted as speculating that President Kennedy promised Premier Khrushchev that "he would work for the signing of a nonaggression treaty between the two blocs if the Soviet Premier would not make the test-ban agreement conditional on the signing of this treaty." HABOKER believes that "each of the two blocs will now make a unilateral declaration that it will abstain from war," while IAMERHAV expresses the opinion that the great powers will now act to prevent the spreading of nuclear arms in the world.

Iran: An Iranian Foreign Ministry statement announcing Iran's "complete support" for the agreement and willingness to join it, hailing it as an "important step" toward reducing international tension and creating more favorable conditions for strengthening world peace, and expressing hope that it will pave the way for more extensive measures to this end, is reported by Teheran radio. A talk carried by the radio declares that the statements made by Kennedy and Khrushchev following the signing of the agreement give people great hope that world problems will be settled. Another radio talk expresses the view that the dispute between the USSR and the CPR forced Moscow to settle some of its problems with the West and that as soon as the differences with Peking are settled difficulties with the West will materialize again.

Turkey: The Foreign Ministry information office has issued a statement welcoming the partial agreement as a "positive step" and expressing the view that the thinking behind "this hopeful beginning will have a positive effect on the work being done for balanced general disarmament," Ankara radio reports.

Greece: Athens radio quotes Premier Pipinelis as describing the agreement as a "very happy event that contributes to a relaxation of tension."

Afghanistan: The Kabul domestic service reports that in a message to President Kennedy and Soviet President Brezhnev the King of Afghanistan says the initialing of the test ban agreement is "a major step toward world peace and security." Press comment reported by the radio terms the agreement "one of the most important reached between the East and West since World War II" and "a major step in the service of peace." The Kabul TIMES is quoted as saying that the agreement is "not only important in itself but important in that it has prepared the ground for future negotiations between the East and West" and that it may prove to be "the beginning of a new phase in international affairs and a contribution toward a gradual solution of other international issues." The paper notes, however, the possible neutralizing effect of the withdrawal clause should the nuclear powers not all join in the agreement.

Africa: Noting that in today's cold war there are "precious few occasions for rejoicing," an Accra radio commentary says the initialing of the treaty certainly is such an occasion. With this "first giant step" taken, Accra radio adds, there is little doubt that with a sincere effort the major powers can arrive at an agreement banning underground tests as well. Noting that the halting of tests is important to all peoples because the earth's atmosphere "is no respecter of borders and ideologies," the commentary quotes U.S. scientist Linus Pauling on the fallout danger to future generations.

Raising the question of future French and Communist Chinese nuclear programs, the commentary says it is vitally important that the United Nations be "strengthened" by "bringing China into what the Americans like to call the area of persuasion" so that all nations can work together to eliminate the arms race.

Ghana press comment reviewed by Accra radio includes a DAILY GRAPHIC editorial which says the treaty "opens the gateway to disarmament" toward which there has been little progress, but notes the complication of France refusing to associate itself with the treaty and planning to continue nuclear experiments. A Ghanaian TIMES comment says that welcome as the agreement is it can be considered nothing more than a welcome. The agreement to ban underground tests as well should be reached with as little delay as possible, the paper adds.

Accra radio reports several times a message from the Accra secretariat of the "World Without the Bomb" movement expressing "great relief and satisfaction" with the treaty, and the hope that it will lead to even more determined efforts for complete disarmament.

A 27 July Lagos international service commentary says all Africa rejoices with the whole world over the agreement which "seems to have arisen out of nothing except mutual confidence on the part of the East and the West." Congratulating President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev on their "give and take attitude," the commentary says however that while Africa rejoices over the treaty, it is compelled to ask the nuclear nations what their stand is on the long-standing demand for the African continent to be declared a nuclear-free zone, and concludes: Africa now calls on the world nuclear powers to help it realize this legitimate aim not later than next September during the annual session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Dar es Salaam radio reports that Tanganyikan Vice President Kawawa had sent a congratulatory message to the three powers welcoming the agreement and voicing hope that tripartite negotiations might continue until all war is made impossible, and that the vast resources devoted to nuclear tests could now be diverted to banning disease, hunger, and ignorance in the world.

Radio Tunis reviews AS-SABAH comment which laments that this "semi-agreement" is neither "everlasting" nor respected by "certain countries in the two camps" and therefore lacks a sufficiently comprehensive character to realize anticipated international relaxation.

Failure to stop the armament race does not relieve humanity from the fear that continuously threatens it, the paper says, suggesting that the signatories to the Moscow treaty have agreed to stop nuclear tests only after having accomplished their objectives which resulted in contamination of the world and the seas by nuclear tests.

The Algerian people, says a Radio Algiers commentary, "warmly hail this great step" which has greatly relieved the world. This "great victory of the peace-loving peoples," the commentary goes on, must now work "to remove the motive for armament, which is misunderstanding emanating from the imperialist "ambitions of some states." Another task, the broadcast adds, "is forcing the other states to stop nuclear testing, even if they have not yet signed the Moscow agreement." The Algerian radio also supplies the text of a joint message from Premier Ben Bella and visiting Tanganyikan President Nyerere to Khrushchev, Macmillan, and Kennedy telling of their governments' "wholehearted support" and "great satisfaction" at this "embodiment of the legitimate desires of the peoples of the world."

President Kennedy's 26 July speech on the test ban agreement is briefly reported by some African radios, but there is so far little comment on it. The Brazzaville radio says the President's speech was "skillful" and swept away the objections of adversaries of the treaty.

E. Latin America and Canada

Brazil: Radio Brasilia reports that President Goulart sent messages to Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Macmillan congratulating them on the signing of the treaty. Goulart cites the "constructive spirit and understanding shown by the delegations of the three nations."

Colombia: The Bogota newspaper EL TIEMPO notes in an editorial the "generally favorable" reaction of the Colombian press. The writer of the EL TIEMPO editorial wonders whether the time has come for Colombia to reexamine its policy of nonrecognition of the USSR.

Chile: The signing of the treaty and Kennedy's 26 July speech are widely reported by Chilean transmitters, with the treaty itself evoking considerable comment. President Alessandri and the Chilean Foreign Ministry declare that the "people and government of Chile enthusiastically hail the agreement." Alessandri's statement expresses the belief that this "great step" will also diminish international tension and strengthen peace, while the Foreign Ministry declaration expresses the hope that favorable prospects have now been opened for general and total disarmament.

The liberal Chilean EL MERCURIO calls the treaty "the most important political event of recent years," but notes that France does not feel bound by the agreement. One Santiago radio commentator calls for caution in appraising the treaty, noting that France is developing nuclear weapons and China is thought to be developing them. However, the commentator declares the treaty is proof that the communists and the West can reach agreements through negotiation.

Mexico: Extensive factual Mexican coverage of the treaty and the President's report to the American people emphasizes Kennedy's remarks that the treaty is "a step toward peace" and a "victory for mankind." Press services quote Mexican Foreign Minister Manuel Tello as stating that Mexico will sign the treaty "as soon as possible." Tello points out that although the treaty represents a "great step" toward general and complete disarmament, these objectives are not yet realized and therefore Mexico will continue to press for an agreement under which Latin America would be declared a nuclear-free zone.

Panama: A Panama City Radio Tribuna commentator, reporting the initialing of the agreement, says it arouses new expectations, may open a new era in East-West relations, and could mean the end of the cold war.

Peru: A Lima Radio Panamericana commentator says the agreement marks the first true expression of understanding between East and West since 1955. A Lima Radio America commentator says the world greets the test ban agreement with true appreciation, hoping that the event signifies a long period of tranquillity. He adds that he regards the agreement as the first step toward total East-West understanding, and that perhaps logic, reason, and good will may suffice to end wars forever.

Canada: Canadian opposition party leaders voice caution in viewing the test ban treaty. Former Conservative Prime Minister Diefenbaker holds that unless the treaty includes Communist China the threat of nuclear war still hangs over the world. The West should take another look at its policy toward China, he suggests, warning that China may have nuclear weapons in a year or two. While New Democratic Party leader Douglas terms the treaty an "important milestone in man's march toward peace on earth and the rule of law," Social Credit Party leader Thompson advises caution since communism's aim of destroying capitalism has not changed. In discussion before the Canadian House of Commons, there is speculation that Canada may play an important role in trying to persuade France to sign the treaty, and that Prime Minister Pearson and perhaps Foreign Minister Martin may visit France before the end of the year for a meeting with President de Gaulle.

II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

A. The USSR

In line with the attempt--manifest since Khrushchev's 2 July speech--to underscore the Soviet "initiative" on the test ban, Moscow broadcasts the text of Khrushchev's interview with IZVESTIYA and PRAVDA on the treaty some 130 times on 26 and 27 July and, in addition, disseminates numerous summaries of it. Khrushchev speaks of the "many years" the Soviet Union has been struggling for a test ban. At the same time, he states that the American and British Governments and their negotiators should be given their "due," and he leaves it to his propagandists to document the notion that through the years it has been the Soviet Union which has been leading the way in test ban proposals.

Similarly, Khrushchev does not take this occasion to assert the "correctness" of Soviet pursuit of a peaceful coexistence policy and takes no jabs at the Chinese this time--leaving this, too, to his propagandists. Thus the domestic service on 29 July reviews a Zhukov PRAVDA article which, after pointing to French and West German opposition to the treaty, asks "with astonishment" how some responsible Chinese leaders can act in concert with the French defenders of nuclear testing and the thermonuclear arms race. Zhukov adds that defense of continued testing by a representative of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions on 25 July "will not be understood by the people." TASS and the domestic service also review a "long" article in the 28 July PRAVDA by Inozemtsev (a frequent writer on the Sino-Soviet polemic since 1960) which calls the initialing of the test ban accord in Moscow new vivid proof that the Leninist principle of coexistence remains the general line of Soviet foreign policy. Inozemtsev reiterates censure of the Chinese leaders for advancing "readiness to incur world war with the aim of overthrowing imperialism" as "the most important criterion of revolutionary character." He also notes pointedly that while Soviet nuclear rocket defenses are in constant readiness, "the USSR will never be the first to set these weapons into action or to unleash a world war." (Khrushchev had reverted to this long-standing Soviet position in his 19 July speech, after the 14 July CPSU "open letter" attacking the Chinese had introduced the formula that "if imperialism starts a war against us we shall not hesitate to use this formidable weapon against the aggressor; but if we are not attacked, we shall not be the first to use this weapon.")

Soviet media carry a substantial account of the President's radio/TV report, but there is little independent Soviet comment. Thus Moscow commentators merely note in passing that the President welcomed the test ban accord and expressed hope for further progress. A domestic service broadcast on 27 July, after noting the "immense interest" displayed in Khrushchev's interview in the U.S. press, says that an appeal to the American people in connection with the agreement "was also made by President Kennedy, whose speech was relayed by all the large U.S. radio and television stations." The TASS account of the President's speech

reports many of his remarks verbatim, but it also omits large portions, particularly such passages bearing directly on the cold war as his reference to the United States having stood on the verge of direct military confrontation with the Soviet Union in Laos, Berlin, and Cuba and his statement that Western policies have attempted to persuade the Soviet Union to forego aggression, direct or indirect. In connection with the latter point, however, IZVESTIYA's diplomatic observer Polyanov tells Radio Moscow's domestic listeners that the President's words about improving relations are incompatible with his "slander and attacks" directed at the Soviet Union, and specifically with his statement that--as rendered by Polyanov--the USSR and other socialist countries should "repudiate their aggressive plans."

The TASS account of the President's speech also omits his reference to U.S. attempts to control nuclear weapons dating back to the Baruch plan of 1946 and his statement that the United States and Britain had proposed limited test ban treaties in 1959, 1961, and 1962. However, commentaries for foreign audiences counter with chapter and verse of Soviet "initiatives" in the test ban area. A commentary for German listeners by Shakhov on the 28th declares that the USSR has been fighting for the discontinuance of nuclear tests for years, and adds "it is by no means the notorious Baruch plan but the Soviet proposal of 1956, which was the first initiative in this direction." A "commentators' roundtable" broadcast to Britain the day before goes to great lengths to document Soviet initiative. Thus, one of the commentators on the panel asserts that the Soviet Union first proposed a treaty to stop tests in March 1956, that in May 1957 the Supreme Soviet appealed to the United States and Britain to facilitate agreement, and that finally on 1 March 1958 the Soviet Union announced a unilateral halt of tests, having received no response to its appeal the previous fall to halt tests on 1 January 1958. The commentator then says the USSR again took the initiative on a test ban treaty in November 1961 and that it is not Moscow's fault that it took 20 months to achieve a partial ban. None of this detailed documentation appears in available domestic service broadcasts.

The most authoritative Soviet comment following Khrushchev's interview appears in IZVESTIYA and PRAVDA editorials on 27 and 29 July. The IZVESTIYA editorial (broadcast in full in the domestic service) plays up the fact that the successful negotiations took place in Moscow. It says that the agreement will soon be signed and that it will go down in history as the "Moscow Treaty." As for the United States and Britain, IZVESTIYA notes only that Khrushchev "congratulated" all people of good will who have added their efforts toward a test ban agreement. But the PRAVDA editorial--as reviewed by TASS on the 29th--also notes that he "gave their due" to the efforts of the U.S. and British governments, and adds that "the achievement of agreement at the Moscow discussions was facilitated by the desire of those political leaders to achieve concrete results."

Khrushchev does not take the occasion in his interview to repeat the Soviet advocacy of tests in all environments, including underground experiments.

But Radio Moscow's listeners have heard the text of the treaty, with its reference to expanding the agreement; the TASS account of the President's speech includes his reference to the possibility of extending the treaty "somewhat later" to other forms of nuclear tests; and Moscow propaganda, unlike Khrushchev in the interview, refers to underground tests. Thus the IZVESTIYA editorial, in discussing the treaty, says "a way is opened to banning all atomic explosions, including underground ones. Three powers have pledged themselves before all mankind to continue their efforts to reach such a ban." The PRAVDA editorial notes that the understanding reached does not apply to underground tests, and then echoes Khrushchev's remark that the test ban does not yet spell an end to the arms race and hence cannot avert the risk of war and cannot ease the economic burden placed on the shoulders of the peoples. A TRUD article on the 27th, as reviewed by TASS, recalls that the USSR wanted an agreement that would prohibit all tests, including underground, but that "since the West was against," the USSR decided to settle for an initial agreement. Available versions of these articles do not recall the Soviet proposal for two or three onsite inspections annually, but the roundtable discussion broadcast to Britain on 27 July does recall it and notes "the West's rejection." A commentary broadcast to scattered NATO audiences on 26-27 July implies that the West will come around to conceding the adequacy of national means to detect underground tests. The commentator remarks that "it took them some time" to admit that national means are sufficient in three environments. He states that "illustrious scientists throughout the world, including American and British ones, 'see that national means are sufficient to detect underground tests. And he cites as a 'striking' example Secretary Rusk's statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on 11 March that 'the improvement of our national earthquake detection potentialities allows us to estimate that seismic stations outside the USSR would be able to detect underground nuclear explosions on the territory of the USSR.'"

Khrushchev in his interview says nothing about other nations adhering to the treaty, but a 28 July TASS dispatch by Professor of International Law Fyodor Kozhevnikov, after observing that the text embodies the main principles of contemporary international law, notes that it is open to all states for signature. And TASS reports a Soviet Peace Committee statement expressing hope that the accord will be joined by "all" the countries of the world. In the commentators' "roundtable discussion" broadcast in the domestic service on 28 July, IZVESTIYA correspondent Matveyev says Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, and Norway have stated their intention to join, and adds that perhaps "up to 100" countries will do so. In the only available Moscow reference to a bloc country's signing of the treaty, one of the commentators on the panel says that Bonn is concerned that the GDR may join the treaty and fears that this may raise the question of recognition in the West.

Discussing French opposition to the treaty, and declaring that France's prestige would be weakened by not adhering to it, commentator Kharlamov calls attention to press speculation that the French may modify their inflexible line to some extent.

He concludes that the position should be clearer after De Gaulle's 29 July press conference. A commentary broadcast to France on the 27th says the indications are that France will refuse to sign and that it will go ahead with the installation of the French testing range in the Pacific. Another commentary, tailored for the French audience on 26 July, takes issue with the French argument that the Soviet attitude on tests was due to "a certain switch in foreign policy beginning with the Caribbean crisis" and that consequently further Western arming would result in more concessions. The commentator tells the French that "more than once have leaders of the West like Kennedy spoken about our strength with profound respect."

Neither Khrushchev nor Moscow comment elaborates on the other partial measures the Soviet leader had advanced in his 19 July speech, although it is made clear that special importance is attached to a nonaggression pact. Commentators point to the reference to a nonaggression pact in the communique on the Moscow talks, and Khrushchev says a nonaggression accord between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty powers "would have all the more significance in that it would embrace all the states at present possessing nuclear weapons." The IZVESTIYA editorial, after noting that the conference of Warsaw Pact countries which just took place in Moscow "approved the results of the test ban talks," says that if a test ban "were joined" with a nonaggression pact "the world could now witness a serious turn toward improvement in the international situation." As regards Khrushchev's other proposals--for control posts to guard against surprise attack, a reduction or freezing of military budgets, and a reduction of troops and exchange of military missions in Germany--commentators do little more than note them, as they do Khrushchev's latest reference to the importance of a German peace treaty and a normalization of West Berlin on that basis. The TASS account of the President's speech mentions that he listed other areas of possible negotiation as "control over preparation for surprise attack or over the number and types of one or another kind of weapon, and further limitation on the dissemination of nuclear weapons." However, Soviet comment to date has not discussed these suggestions.

B. Communist China

Early on 26 July the Chinese news agency NCNA carried a cryptic report that the test ban treaty had been initialed. Peking did not convey its assessment of the agreement until the 28th, when NCNA transmitted a lengthy account of the President's speech interlarded with editorial comment calculated to point up Khrushchev's "capitulation" and the great advantage the treaty gives the United States. Some two hours after this editorialized account of the President's speech, NCNA released an "editor's note" explaining that in addition to the full text of the treaty, Peking has released extracts of the President's 26 July remarks, Khrushchev's PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA interview, and "reactions from various quarters." Since its first acknowledgment on 11 July of Khrushchev's 2 July announcement that the USSR would be willing to agree to a partial test ban, Peking has made clear: in an unprecedented volume of propaganda, and with increasing shrillness, its unalterable opposition ~~Approved For Release 2004/03/11 : CIA-RDP65B00383R000100280019-3~~

(Peking has completely ignored Khrushchev's 19 July speech, in which he specified other partial disarmament measures which should follow a test ban.) The 19 July PEOPLE'S DAILY editorial (widely broadcast, including 10 times in Russian), ostensibly attacking the U.S. "nuclear fraud," was exceptionally frank in expressing Communist China's concern over the worldwide approval which would greet a test ban and its fears that the "vigilance" of the peoples would be dulled and the peace partisans movement thereby diluted. Chinese sentiments about Khrushchev's "appeasement" of the West were also made clear in Peking's tendentious reports of the Moscow talks. Thus, Western press reports and various statements by U.S. leaders were quoted at length to document the basic tenet that the limited treaty, which would allow the United States to continue the kind of tests it has specialized in, would be of great advantage to the West.

While Peking's voluminous propaganda clearly implied that the CPR should not and would not be deterred from developing a nuclear weapons capability, it stopped short of explicitly referring to such a program. However, speaking on 26 July, on the anniversary of the "victory" in the Korean war, the prominent Chinese spokesman Kuo Mo-jo declared that "nuclear weapons can by no means remain for long a monopoly of a small number of people and countries. . . . It will not be long before the attempt by a small number of countries to control the destiny of the people with their monopoly of weapons will be thwarted. It is our firm conviction that whatever new technology imperialism can master can definitely be mastered by our revolutionary people." (Such vague temporal references to the Chinese nuclear weapons program have been made in the past but have been rare. There was a flurry of propaganda last September, conveying apparent CPR concern that there might be progress toward a test ban, calling attention to CPR dissent from the Soviet position that measures should be taken to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; but this propaganda carefully avoided the matter of actual CPR plans or activities in the field of nuclear research.)

The 28 July NCNA editor's note on the treaty says blatantly, in a clear allusion to the "revisionist" Soviet Union, that "in an all-out effort to boost the treaty after it was initialed, certain persons described it as 'of great international importance,' 'a victory for the world forces of peace,' 'a great triumph of the policy of peaceful coexistence,' 'herald of peace,' 'a turning point in the history of mankind,' and so on and so forth." NCNA then sets out to demonstrate how the treaty should be evaluated by quoting at length from the President's speech. According to NCNA, the President "laid bare completely the substance of this treaty--that it cannot restrict the United States, whereas it can restrict others, restricting those other socialist countries not possessing nuclear weapons, and can restrain the socialist countries' efforts to strengthen their national defense." And NCNA caps this by saying that "the leaders and press of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the GDR, and the French and Italian communist parties went so far as to laud this treaty to the skies, calling it something of a prodigy. Is this not deceiving oneself and others?"

NCNA concludes the editor's note by quoting Undersecretary Harriman's remark that an agreement was reached because Khrushchev "very much wanted one at this time." It notes that, as Walter Lippmann had done earlier, the President stated that substantially the same treaty had been offered by the West last August; and NCNA adds that to help its readers grasp the substance of the partial treaty, it was publishing, along with the treaty text, Kuznetsov's remarks in Geneva last August on the similar draft offered by the West at that time.

The Peking NCNA's review of the CPR press for 29 July notes that PEOPLE'S DAILY carries a picture of Khrushchev embracing Harriman. Almost the entire press review is devoted to the test ban treaty.

(Note: As yet there has been no mention of the initialing of the treaty in broadcasts and press agency transmissions from pro-Peking North Korea. The only monitored reference in North Vietnamese media to date is a short news item on 27 July quoting news from Moscow that agreement has been reached. Hanoi's VIETNAM NEWS AGENCY, in a Vietnamese-language transmission that customarily carries "reference" material for an apparently restricted audience, has transmitted "reference news" in the form of Western news agency dispatches on the progress of the Moscow talks; but none of these dispatches has been used in transmissions for mass consumption.)

C. EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

1. The Pro-Soviet Bloc

East Germany: Welcoming the test ban agreement as furnishing "practical proof that it is possible to reach an understanding if good will exists," East German comment makes it clear that it favors a similar attitude being applied to the questions of a nonaggression pact and a German peace treaty. But propagandists stay within the outlines of Khrushchev's proposals in his PRAVDA-IZVESTIYA interview: Thus NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on 28 July emphasizes that world reaction will inevitably cause further negotiations on safeguarding peace, especially negotiations on Khrushchev's recent proposals for a nonaggression pact, the withdrawal of foreign troops from East and West Germany, a German peace treaty, and the solution of the West Berlin problem. Warning against the anti-peace policy of the Adenauer and De Gaulle governments and against reactionary forces in the United States, the paper tells the West Germans that it is their responsibility to oppose this policy and to insist on peaceful coexistence. (Khrushchev's interview is carried textually on 27 July by NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, BERLINER ZEITUNG, JUNGE WELT, and TRIBUENE. The only reference to President Kennedy's 26 July address in the German press is a brief report in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND; East Berlin radio has not been heard to mention the President's address.)

East Berlin radio reports that Ulbricht, on his arrival at Berlin-Schoenefeld airport, declared that the GDR people can be content with the test ban agreement, which "will help develop relations among the big powers in the spirit of peaceful coexistence." Ulbricht adds that a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries would ease rapprochement of both German states and negotiations on a peace treaty. BERLINER ZEITUNG comments that what has been possible for nuclear experiments will be equally possible for the solution of many other problems. NATIONAL ZEITUNG feels the success of the Moscow talks "should improve the prospects for a realistic solution of the German question."

East German comment on the agreement invariably refers to "Bonn's furious reaction" to the Moscow accord. Noting that the Adenauer Government rightly fears that the agreement could become the beginning of a major policy of detente in the world, Deutschlandsender says that Bonn is anxiously awaiting the next GDR People's Chamber meeting in fear that Ulbricht "might renew, make more specific, or even enlarge his proposals for a policy of reason and good will in Germany" and thus further isolate West German policy. Noting that Bonn is hoping that the Goldwater faction and De Gaulle will wreck the agreement, the radio says that the French president has been caught off guard by the French public's demand that France terminate its testing.

Czechoslovakia: Radio Prague, in welcoming the agreement which "may be considered as the beginning of the end of the cold war," announces that Czechoslovakia will be among those countries which will join the agreement. While giving a favorable assessment of the agreement, Czechoslovak media caution against excessive optimism: "We must not forget," says Prague radio, "that the cause of peace has not yet won a complete victory and much remains to be accomplished." Questions regarding the security of Central Europe--primarily the question of Germany, problems outside the European area, and the question of disarmament--are still awaiting solution, ZEMEDELISKE NOVINY points out.

Prague radio, briefly reporting President Kennedy's 26 July address, says it bespeaks "responsible Western statesmen's" recent awareness of the true strength of peaceful coexistence. RUDE PRAVO, printing "substantial excerpts" of the President's speech, comments editorially that despite the fact the speech "was not free of cold war ballast and an absolutely false interpretation" of postwar history, "on the whole it must be assessed positively."

Bulgaria: In a government statement, Bulgaria formally announces its readiness to participate in the treaty, and expresses the hope that it will come into effect "as soon as possible." Like other Sofia comment, the statement points out that this is "only the beginning": Redoubled efforts should now be made for the solution of other questions, such as the signing of a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression treaty and the creation of nuclear-free zones. RABOTNICHESKO DELO terms the test ban agreement as a "brilliant victory for the policy of peaceful coexistence--a policy persistently pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet Government." Other press

comment, Echoing this sentiment, sees the agreement as giving momentum to the idea of settling disputed issues through negotiations. One can understand the reaction of the militarists and revenge-seekers to the news, says RABOTNICHESKO DELO, but the stand by the French Government "causes regret."

Poland: Warsaw sources hail the test ban agreement as "an important and valuable step forward." TRYBUNA LUDU says it "constitutes the first step toward replacing the 'balance of fear' policy with the 'balance of security' policy." The paper says the Warsaw Pact has recognized the agreement "as a success of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence." Referring to West German and American rightwing opposition to the agreement, Warsaw radio hopes that General De Gaulle will come out of "his splendid isolation" and join the agreement.

TRYBUNA LUDU, comparing President Kennedy's speech with Khrushchev's PRAVDA-IZVESTIYA interview, says these statements show the differences between the social systems the two statesmen represent and the political situation prevailing in each country: Whereas President Kennedy has to overcome opposition to the treaty within his own country as well as the Western camp, Khrushchev has the solid support of his country and the Warsaw Pact. In this light, the paper says, Khrushchev's statement amounted to an appeal to the Western powers to reach agreement and an assurance that the Soviet side "will not diminish its efforts aimed at attaining the consolidation of peace."

Hungary: While Budapest reaction does not as yet indicate Hungarian adherence to the agreement, a commentary broadcast to Europe notes that the "atomic truce" can only be complete if other states, particularly France, adhere to it. Budapest media join with the other Soviet-oriented satellites in welcoming the result of the talks. The text of the treaty appears on the front pages of the press, and the Hungarian radio leads off its broadcasts with roundups of favorable world reaction to the agreement. MFI editorially observes that almost every commentator believes that "something has been set moving and the summer of 1963 marks the beginning of a new and unusual stage of diplomacy."

Rumania: Commenting favorably on the talks, Bucharest on 27 July describes the agreement as an "international deed which could also create prospects for the achievement of new progress in the field of international life." It notes that the agreement could open a path to the solution of other problems such as a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression treaty, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, and steps for the prevention of surprise attack. It cautions, however, that there are reactionary circles in the West which oppose this agreement, and says that in the United States "ultrareactionary Senator Barry Goldwater has placed himself at the head of a group making noisy opposition to the agreement." Bucharest adds that the "ultrareactionaries at the Pentagon and in the U.S. Senate are in the minority to the favorable reaction coming in from all parts of the world." Bucharest had followed the progress of the talks and carried the TASS communique on the agreement, and a 27 July broadcast carried a factual report of P2004/03/11 Key. CIA-RDP65B00383R000100280019-3 day.

2. Yugoslavia

A Yugoslav Foreign Ministry statement "warmly welcomes" the initialing of a partial test ban agreement "as an event of the greatest international significance." The statement, summarized by TANYUG, maintains that the accord reached "convincingly confirms the correctness of negotiating and the need for mutual confidence, serves as evidence of the practical value of the policy of peaceful coexistence, and opens up considerable prospects for further negotiations." A POLITIKA article, TANYUG reports, "emphasizes the great merits of the three signatory powers," but points out that with this credit goes "responsibility for the future development of everything relating to this agreement and all that may violate it."

TANYUG's Moscow correspondent reports that President Kennedy's statement on the significance of the agreement and his appeal to the American people to support its ratification have been "very favorably received" in the Soviet capital. The President's appeal, the reporter says, "is interpreted as a sign of encouragement" in view of the increased efforts of American reactionaries to impede approval of the treaty. The agency's Washington correspondent cables that capital circles believe that the Senate will eventually pass the agreement, adding that the "first reactions of high military men have been more favorable than expected." A TANYUG dispatch from Peking says the Chinese are maintaining their "adverse attitude toward this agreement." The Chinese attitude, according to BORBA, is motivated by their "unreasonable desire to enter the nuclear club at any expense."

3. ALBANIA

Tirana radio briefly reports the official communique on the conclusion of the talks, while ATA's review of the Albanian press says only that "the papers deal with the communique on the Moscow talks, pointing out that France is to continue development of its nuclear weapons." The radio's comment and reportage during the course of the Moscow discussions echoed Peking in stressing that with the talks the Kennedy administration hoped to strengthen its military position by limiting the spread of nuclear weapons and preventing other countries from strengthening their national defenses--one of the primary targets in this respect being the CPR. The real reason for a test ban treaty, says Tirana, is "to expand U.S. nuclear arms to establish an imperialist American order over the world." The radio calls on the "peoples of the world who oppose nuclear war" to "expose this trick of American imperialism." In his 26 July speech to the nation, Tirana declares, President Kennedy "openly said" that he considered the limited restrictions of the treaty a positive factor.

D. CUBA

Speaking on 26 July over Cuban radio and television, Fidel Castro calls the nuclear test ban agreement a "victory for world peace" and a "victory for the peace policy of the Soviet Union. If the imperialists," he continues, "were the only possessors of nuclear arms they would not have signed such an agreement. It is the awareness of a superior force in the military field that forces them to reflect and makes them adopt this type of measure. Naturally, all the world is happy to receive this news. This shows how the imperialists are, how they act, when they have to face the reality of force, when they face realities they cannot overcome."

Havana broadcasts echo Castro in hailing the agreement as a step in the right direction. TV commentator Gonzalez Jerez, in a 19 July talk, had said that even if such a treaty were obtained, "this would not in itself mean the solution of today's great problems." Yet he saw every peace treaty, "no matter how limited," as a victory over the "desperate" imperialists. And on 27 July Havana quotes Juan Marinello, in his capacity as "president of the Movement for Peace and Sovereignty of Peoples," as saying that the agreement, "although it does not signify the full crystallization of the universal hope, is an important step toward that objective." The treaty, he says, "deserves the applause of all those who love peaceful coexistence," and "advance should be made" for a complete prohibition of nuclear weapons "and their complete destruction."

Commentator Kuchilan, on Havana television, sees a note of "great gravity" in the fact that the treaty will have to be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the U.S. Senate. "I refer to the Versailles Treaty when Wilson proposed a League of Nations and the plan was approved in Europe, yet the U.S. Senate defeated the treaty and it did not come into being."